

ment of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration appropriation bill, 1961, pp. 19-21).

If the rationale of the cranberry program was applied to the present situation, we would make payments on only wholesome milk, but not on the contaminated milk, and this would not help the producers whose milk is banned from the market. We are now supporting the price of wholesome milk by buying butter, cheese, and nonfat solids under the Agricultural Act of 1949. In the past we have also purchased such products with section 32 funds for distribution to schools, charitable institutions, and relief feeding.

Even if no question existed as to the legal availability of section 32 funds to make payments on contaminated products, we would still have reservations concerning whether the facts set forth above would justify such use.

On the basis of present statistics, only one or two out of a hundred samples tested by the new sensitive method disclose the presence of actionable amounts of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticide residues in milk. In one case it was definitely proven that the procedure was not followed when the insecticide was applied in the spring.

Moreover, there would be no way to verify in individual cases that the procedures had been followed. The heptachlor residues found in milk this spring would have had to come from alfalfa grown on fields to which heptachlor was applied prior to November 15, 1962.

This inability to verify compliance with approved procedures in connection with indemnity claims raises a serious public policy question. We know that the use of pesticides and insecticides has been of great benefit to the farmer and to the consumer. The public has the right to demand that every precaution be taken in their application. One of the means of insuring that such precautions are taken is the threat of financial loss arising out of the condemnation of contaminated food. The removal of this threat by indemnity payments could well lessen the care taken in their use and this result would certainly not be in the public interest.

This is not to say that insecticide residues are not a problem and a serious one, but the problem is not confined to milk. It covers all food products, including fruits, vegetables, and meat. Many lots of these products are condemned each year and the producers of these products suffer serious losses without indemnity payments of any kind, despite the fact that the improved sensitivity of detection techniques applies to them as well as to milk.

Both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are deeply interested in protecting the public health, and at the same time neither of them want to hurt the farmer. Our two Departments are cooperating closely in a common effort to find a solution to the insecticide residue problem. This joint effort is receiving the active support of the Congress. The House of Representatives has approved a budget request for expanded research on pesticides and insecticides, including effects of residues.

We do not believe that indemnity payments is the answer to this problem, particularly on the basis of the facts now known. We think the better solution is to direct our efforts toward learning more about insecticide residues and tolerance levels which cannot possibly endanger public health. This will not only protect the producer, but will maintain consumer confidence in a pure and wholesome milk supply.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. I am sure the Senator brings up a question that is of great interest to many Senators. Several States have been mentioned that are involved in situations similar to that of Maryland. I have received mail from milk producers in Michigan along the same line. However, despite this fact, the legislation involved in the amendment has already been or is before the Agriculture Committee in the House of Representatives. I have been advised that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the Senate, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], has indicated a great interest in the measure. I have heard him speak about it personally. I am sure he is prepared, at an early date, to proceed in this area.

I think it is one which should not come into the picture in a bill which came from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, because the committee has not had an opportunity to give it proper treatment. I am sure better legislation would be obtained—and it is needed legislation—to compensate the milk producers who have been damaged by the procedures of the various agencies of the U.S. Government.

I hope the Senator will not press his amendment at this time, but will leave it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the understanding on the part of the leadership that this matter will be given prompt attention in this session.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I say to the Senator from Maryland that I support the purpose of his amendment, because the milk industry has been not only jeopardized but seriously threatened by the impact of pesticides.

The distinguished Senator from Maryland will recall that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has been conducting a full-scale inquiry into the harmful effects of pesticides and what type of controls ought to be utilized to protect the public health.

The Senator from Connecticut, as a member of my subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, has been conducting hearings under a special resolution for that subcommittee.

Other Senators have proposals similar to that proposed by the Senator from Maryland. It is my view that these proposals should go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—not to be delayed. I do not want the Senator to get that idea. The House has already undertaken hearings. The Agriculture Committee will have several sessions between now and adjournment.

The Senator from Minnesota will press, with all the power at his command—limited though it be—for prompt action by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I feel that not only would such an amendment to the pending bill be somewhat nongermine—that, of course, would not be fatal—but the pending bill has a particular purpose; and I hope that the Senator will accede to the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan, who is the Senator in charge of the bill, in the knowledge that the Senator from Minnesota will join the Senator from Maryland and his colleague in his endeavor to have much needed legislation enacted for the protection of the dairy farmers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, those of us who have been faced with this particular problem are dedicated to the support of an amendment of this type. However, we realize that the argument presented by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the majority whip, is a compelling one, and the expression made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], who is in charge of the bill, also make it important that we not press the matter at this time. Nevertheless, I commend the junior Senator from Maryland, joined by the senior Senator from Maryland, for having presented the amendment.

In Jefferson County, in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia, we have a similar problem. It is a very acute one. I conferred with one farmer, who told me that his entire livestock herd may be lost. Thousands of dollars are involved—a substantial financial loss to this one farmer alone; much privation is already being experienced.

I take some comfort from the expressions here that the matter will not be delayed, and that the appropriate committee of the Senate will move into this matter. I again commend the Senator from Maryland for calling the attention of all Senators to this very perplexing problem, which is one that needs solution. I believe the discussion has been clarifying and helpful.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who are expressing their support for the subject matter of the amendment which I have offered. I am encouraged by the majority whip's comment that he will use his recognized powers of persuasion to bring this matter to the early attention of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I point out to the Senate that a large number of farmers in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, and Maryland have suffered grievously. This may well be only the beginning. Many farmers in our areas may receive great and undue harm from this obvious paradox in our Government's approach to agriculture. On the one hand the Government recommends vigorously the use of pesticides and on the other hand, shortly thereafter, if not at the same time, it tells the

July 22

16110

farmers they cannot sell their crops because they used those same pesticides.

Because of the persuasive arguments by the manager of the bill and also by the majority whip and with their gracious assurances in mind, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 1126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that the amendment may be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1126), ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

On page 108, between lines 21 and 22, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 614. (a) In carrying out the provisions of parts B and C of title I, part A of title II, and part B of title III, the Director shall establish procedures which shall facilitate effective participation of the States in programs assisted under such parts. In pursuance thereof he shall use his best efforts to develop State plans to carry out the provisions of such parts and shall utilize State agencies and facilities in the administration of such parts whenever and wherever practicable, either at the initiation of programs under such parts or in the course thereof. Procedures established by the Director shall include provision for the referral of applications for assistance under such parts to the Governor of each State affected, or his designee, for such comments as he may deem appropriate in cases not otherwise provided for in this subsection.

"(b) The Director is authorized to make grants to or to contract with States and appropriate State agencies for the payment of the expenses of such agencies in performing their functions under subsection (a) hereof, and for the purpose of providing technical assistance to State and local government agencies in developing, conducting, and administering programs under the parts of this Act listed in subsection (a)."

Redesignate sections 614 and 615 as sections 615 and 616, respectively.

Mr. JAVITS. I reserve the time on my amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, on July 21, I submitted an amendment which would compensate dairy farmers for the great losses they have been sustaining because of their milk being confiscated.

I am sorry that a similar amendment has just been withdrawn. I am modifying my amendment, and it will be printed and lie on the table. I intend to call it up tomorrow. This is a very serious problem, and I intend to pursue the amendment very vigorously tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Oregon.

CUBAN AGGRESSION AND THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my honor and privilege to serve, with the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), as one of the two Senate aids to the Secretary of State at the diplomatic conference which is now being held in Washington of the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States. This historic conference is being held by the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States to consider the charges which have been filed against Cuba by an investigating committee of the Organization of American States which has found Castro Cuba to be guilty of acts of aggression and subversion against Venezuela.

Mr. President, Senator HICKENLOOPER and I are joined on the House side by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, Jr., Democrat, of Alabama, and WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, Republican, of California.

I believe that every Member of Congress and every American would have been extremely proud, as I was proud this afternoon, to listen to the speech of our Secretary of State, as he presented to this historic conference the position of the United States in respect to the charges which the investigating committee of OAS has filed against Cuba for its acts of aggression and subversion against Venezuela.

I consider it a great privilege and honor to ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point the statement made by the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, at the ninth meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the countries comprising the Organization of American States at the Pan American Union, in Washington, today.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK AT THE NINTH MEETING OF FOREIGN MINISTERS, PAN AMERICAN UNION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 21-24, 1964

Mr. Chairman, fellow Ministers, you have complimented us all, Mr. Chairman, in your willingness to serve as our presiding officer, and your chairmanship gives great satisfaction to every colleague at this table.

Five times in as many years the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics have met to consider situations affecting the peace of the hemisphere arising in whole or in part from the interventionist activities of the Castro regime. This is a measure of the frequency with which our regional security system has had to act to thwart Castro's aggressive designs.

In the face of continued Cuban aggression, the time has now come to make it abundantly clear to the Castro regime that the American Governments in complete solidarity will no longer tolerate its efforts to export revolution through the classic Communist techniques of terror, and guerrilla warfare, and the infiltration of arms and subversive agents.

ORIGINS OF CUBAN AGGRESSION

The pattern of Cuban aggression emerged soon after the Castro regime came to power in 1959. You will recall the armed expeditions which set forth from Cuban territory against Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Haiti during the first 6 months of that year. When this direct method of overthrowing governments failed, the Cuban Government turned to the indirect technique of subversion. From the sending of armed landing parties, Castro shifted to training in subversive techniques, transfer of funds for subversive elements, dissemination of systematic and hostile propaganda and the clandestine shipment of both arms and men. The new pattern emerged in full bloom last year when Castro made a major effort to disrupt the democratic elections in Venezuela and, beyond that, to destroy the democratic institutions of that country.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD IN CUBA

But it took some time to "tool up" the new mechanism for indirect aggression. Meanwhile, the Castro regime embarked upon another type of assault against the traditions and principles of the American community of nations: the establishment of the Communist system in Cuba itself and the facilitation of military intervention by an extra-continental totalitarian power in this hemisphere.

I will not take the time here to go into all the details, but you will recall that by mid-1960 the construction of the apparatus of a Communist state in Cuba was well advanced. Likewise its ties with the Soviet bloc and with Communist China were firmly established. Castro signed the first agreement with the Soviets in February 1960 and with the Red Chinese in July. Cuba established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union in May 1960, and with the satellite countries in succeeding months. On July 9, 1960, Premier Khrushchev made his offer to support Cuba with rocket power, and President Dorticos replied the following day hailing as he put it "the message of solidarity spoken by the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union." These words were shortly followed by deeds in the form of shipments of large quantities of Soviet arms. On January 2, 1961, Castro paraded these weapons for the world to see, and the flow of arms and the parades continued in the years since.

By August 1960 when the American Foreign Ministers met in San Jose for the seventh meeting of consultation, Cuba clearly had become Communist and international communism had opened an important beachhead in the Western Hemisphere.

THE HEMISPHERE'S INITIAL RESPONSE

The response of the American governments to this flagrant challenge to hemisphere security fell short—surely we would have to say now—of the nature of the threat. Neither at the fifth meeting of consultation in 1959 nor the seventh meeting in 1960 did the Foreign Ministers act in a way to make clear to the Castro regime that the transformation of Cuba into a base of operations for international communism would not be tolerated by the American community.

The task of throwing up the hemisphere's defenses devolved on subsequent consultations beginning with the eighth meeting of Foreign Ministers in January 1962, at Punta del Este.

TRANSFORMATION OF THE HEMISPHERE'S ATTITUDE

The change in the hemisphere's attitude toward the danger represented by a Commu-

nist Cuba became clearly discernible in the careful study made by the Inter-American Peace Committee in November and December 1961. At the request of the Government of Peru, the Committee examined, among other things, the Castro regime's relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc and Cuba's promotion of subversion and revolution in other American Republics. The Committee in its report arrived at these principal conclusions—and let us not forget this documentation of our hemisphere:

1. "The identification of the Government of Cuba with the Marxist-Leninist ideology and socialism of the Soviet type, together with the rebuilding of the Cuban political organization on the basis of the one-party system of government that is in accordance with that ideology, presupposes positions that are basically antagonistic to the principle established in the charter of the Organization . . . that the solidarity of the American States and the high aims which are sought through it require the political organization of those states on the basis of the effective exercise of representative democracy.

2. "The present connections of the Government of Cuba with the Sino-Soviet bloc of countries are manifestly incompatible with the principles and standards that govern the regional system . . . [and] will prevent the said government from fulfilling the obligations in the charter of the Organization and the treaty of reciprocal assistance.

3. "As regards the intense subversive activity in which the countries of the Sino-Soviet bloc are engaged in America and the activities of the Cuban Government . . . it is evident that they would constitute acts that, within the system for the 'political defense' of the hemisphere, have been classed as acts of 'political aggression' or 'aggression of a nonmilitary character.'"

Based in large part on the findings of the Peace Committee, the American governments took their first, historic stand against communism in Cuba at the Punta del Este Conference. Many of you were there. The fundamental decisions made then have been of major importance to us since. They stimulated a new awareness of the dangers inherent in the Communist offensive in America. They gave fresh impetus to efforts to develop internal security capabilities to combat subversion. They helped to fulfill a moral commitment of the Organization of American States to defend its basic purposes and principles against the open challenge of one of its members. And they served to pave the way for the swift, decisive and equally historic decision taken by the American governments on October 23, 1962, which played such a significant role in forcing the Soviet Union to withdraw its offensive weapons systems from Cuba.

CUBAN INTERVENTION IN VENEZUELA

The missile crisis removed whatever doubt remained concerning the Castro regime's status as a pawn of the Soviet bloc. It should have served as a warning to Castro and his followers that the American governments were united and firm in their resolve not to permit Cuba to be used as a base for the expansion of communism on this continent and that their patience was running out. Again he did not heed the warning. Instead, he redoubled his subversive offensive against the hemisphere. And chose Venezuela as a primary target.

I would recall that in the summer of 1963 a Special Committee of the Council of the OAS, under the distinguished leadership of Ambassador de Lavalle of Peru, completed a detailed study of the Cuban effort to promote subversion in our countries. And in its report the committee noted that:

"Immediately after the October crisis, spokesmen for the Cuban Government began making a series of speeches openly advocating armed insurrection in Latin America as a means of introducing economic and social changes based on the Communist system. Although this does not constitute a position that is entirely different from that hitherto held by the Castro regime, the frequency, intensity, and origin of the provocations are such that they lead the Committee to conclude that the Cuban regime has begun a new phase of promoting and encouraging violent subversion in other countries of the hemisphere."

The Committee also called attention to what it described as "two facts that are intimately related to the policy enunciated by the Cuban leaders." "One of these," the Committee stated, "is the tactic of bringing hundreds of persons to Cuba from all the countries of the hemisphere in order to indoctrinate them and train them in the techniques of subversion. The second is the well-known plan of sabotage, terrorism, and guerrilla action that has been unleashed in certain countries, particularly in Venezuela, and the impetus that the Cuban Communist leaders have given to this movement."

In further explanation of its conclusion on Venezuela, the Committee added: "There is no doubt that the Castro regime has selected Venezuela as its primary target. This was indicated by the Communist spokesman Blas Roca in his speech on January 24, 1963, commemorating the fifth anniversary of the fall of Perez Jimenez: 'When the people of Venezuela achieve victory; he said when they gain full independence from imperialism . . . then all of America will be aflame, all America will advance, all of America will be freed once and for all from the ominous yoke of Yankee imperialism. If their struggle is a help to us today; he said their victory will be an even greater help. Then we shall no longer be a solitary island in the Caribbean confronting the Yankee imperialists, but rather we shall have a base of support on the mainland.'"

And try they did—until they came up against the resolute will of the leaders and the people of Venezuela. The Cuban effort is detailed in the report of the OAS Investigating Committee, which serves as the basis for our action.

The Committee found these to be the chief manifestations of the Castro regime's intervention in Venezuela:

"1. A systematic and hostile campaign of propaganda against the Government of Venezuela, as well as the incitement to and support of the Communist subversion that is being carried out in that country;

"2. Training, in all kinds of subversive activities of numerous Venezuelan citizens, who traveled to Cuba for that purpose;

"3. Remittance of funds through these travelers and other channels, for the purpose of maintaining and increasing subversive activities; and

"4. The provision of arms to guerrilla and terrorist groups operating in Venezuela, as shown by the shipment of arms discovered on November 1, 1963, on the Paraguaná Peninsula, and the plan for the capture of the city of Caracas."

The evidence to support these findings is clearly and convincingly set forth in the report. The facts established by the investigating committee leave no doubt whatsoever of Cuba's part in this conspiracy against Venezuela.

I know of no greater tribute to democracy in this hemisphere, Mr. Chairman, in modern times—and no greater rebuff to the sinister designs of the Castro regime—than the manner in which the Venezuelan people went to the polls on December 1, 1963.

Based on this experience, it is my firm

conviction that we have a solemn responsibility both to the Venezuelan people and to our own peoples not to permit the Castro regime to mount another subversive assault against any American republic. Our governments acted resolutely against a dictator of the right who plotted to assassinate President Betancourt in 1960. They unanimously agreed on sanctions. I now ask: Can we do less against a dictator of the left who tried to assassinate democracy in Venezuela?

LIKELIHOOD OF CONTINUED CUBAN SUBVERSION

By its very nature international communism is aggressive and expansive. We see it at work in all parts of the world, constantly probing and testing for weak spots which it might exploit. In modern dress it marches in the guise of diplomatic relations, trade missions and cultural exchanges, and peace movements, and youth organizations and the like. It flies the false ideological banners of "peaceful coexistence" and "wars of national liberation." But no one should be deceived.

We in the United States are under no illusion as to the designs of the Communists against us and the free world. We know that the Communist menace is deadly serious; that they seek their goals through varied means and that deceit is a standard element in their tactics.

We are fully aware—and should be—that Moscow, as well as Peking and Habana, remains committed to the Communist world revolution. Chairman Khrushchev tells us frankly and bluntly that coexistence cannot extend to the ideological sphere, that between us there will be continued competition and conflict. Castro said on July 26 last year that in Latin America the course to follow is violent revolution waged by fighting revolutionaries, that the correlation of forces in the world had changed in favor of those seeking change through armed struggle, and that when revolutionaries in other Latin American countries know how to fulfill their duty, they will have the decided support of the Soviet Union and all the socialist camp, including Cuba.

Last week the Cuban Government, following the practice of other Communist governments, announced its slogans for this year's July 26 celebration. It is no accident, and indeed it is highly pertinent to our deliberations, that among the slogans this one appears: "Long live the heroic struggle of the Venezuelan people." In plain language that means: "Long live the struggle against the heroic Venezuelan people."

We should have no illusions about Castro's continuing purpose to export the Cuban revolution. He came to power with the design of converting the Andes into the Sierra Maestra of the Americas. That apparently remains his design. His temperament and ambition, the dynamics of his internal situation, the counsel of those whom he serves and those who serve him—all compel him to promote subversion as a means for breaking out of his insular position.

After years of self-righteous protestations that Cuba exported its revolution by example only, Castro in a recent press interview finally acknowledged that Cuba had been supporting, and will continue to support, subversive groups in other countries. This admission, it is true, adds nothing to what we had already learned through experience. It does serve, however, to underscore Castro's purpose to give the hemisphere no respite in his relentless campaign to foment subversion whenever and wherever conditions permit.

In this interview Castro also tried to put Cuba's subversive activities on the bargaining counter. I wish to make one point very clear: that as far as the United States is concerned, the encouragement and support of subversion by the Castro regime against other countries of this hemisphere is not a

subject for bargaining. It simply must stop. And when it does, the hemisphere will know it without the need for any discussions with the Castro regime.

TASK OF THIS MEETING

As I stated at the outset, I regard our task as being to determine what measures should now be taken to impress on the Castro regime that the hemisphere will no longer permit its subversive acts against the American Republics. In my opinion, there are three types of measures which we can take to drive this point home.

One should represent the American community's reaction to Castro's efforts to destroy democracy in Venezuela. Certainly this intervention should not be allowed to go without imposition of sanctions.

I want to make it very clear that the United States considers that the adoption of sanctions by the Foreign Ministers would be directed exclusively against the Castro regime and not against any other state or people. I hope this can be made clear in the final act of this conference. Rather our concern is that we not fail in our obligations to a sister republic which has been made the victim of aggression and, indeed, which even today continues to spend its blood and treasure to combat Castro-Communist subversion and to defend democracy and freedom. To respond to the call of our sister republic for collective action is our paramount obligation.

The second type of measure would carry the community's clear warning to the Castro regime that if it persists in acts of subversion in other American Republics, the full weight of the regional security system will be applied. This should serve as a deterrent. And I trust the Castro regime will heed such a message.

Awareness that subversion, supported by terror, sabotage and guerrilla action, as practiced by the international Communist movement, is as dangerous a form of aggression as an armed attack has been very slow in developing in this hemisphere, as well as in other parts of the world. I think it is fair to say that until very recently there has been a lack of sufficient understanding of this point everywhere, and this has led to uncertainty in some quarters as to whether our regional security system possesses an adequate mechanism for dealing with Communist subversion.

In the opinion of my government, there is no doubt that the Rio Treaty clearly recognizes multiple forms of aggression and provides effective machinery for defending against them. The preamble states that the treaty is intended, among other things, "to provide for effective reciprocal assistance to meet armed attacks against any American State, and in order to deal with threats of aggression against any of them." Article 3 provides for mutual assistance in meeting an armed attack against any signatory; article 6 specifically recognizes the existence of "aggression which is not an armed attack"; and finally, article 9, while defining unprovoked armed attack and invasion by the armed forces of a State as aggression, opens with the very significant wording: "In addition to other acts which the Organ of Consultation may characterize as aggression." And thus, we feel that the Rio Treaty specifically recognizes the existence of various forms of aggression and, most importantly, recognizes the authority of the Council of the Organization of American States, or the Meeting of Foreign Ministers, to characterize them as such. Article 3 of the Rio Treaty spells out procedures for prompt action in the event of armed attack. And article 8 does the same for a wide variety of situations falling short of armed attack.

A third type of measure should urge our own governments and those of other free world countries to take appropriate steps in the field of trade with Cuba. This is appropriate

because the Communist threat to this hemisphere is a threat also to other parts of the free world.

I should like to mention two matters which, although not directly related to the subject of this meeting, nevertheless have an important bearing on our deliberations.

MESSAGE TO THE CUBAN PEOPLE

"The one is that we should remember that the Cuban people, both inside and outside their troubled homeland, will be following our deliberations with greatest interest. They should know that they have not been forgotten and that our desires for a free Cuba remain unchanged. I know of no more eloquent and concise expression of these desires than that which President Kennedy and the Presidents of the Central American Republics and Panama, included in the Declaration of San José in March 1963. As a restatement of my Government's views on this point and in tribute to the memory of the late President, I should simply like to repeat a portion of that declaration to which other colleagues have already generally alluded. It states:

"The Presidents declared that they have no doubt that the genuine Cuban revolution will live again, and its betrayers will fall into the shadows of history, and the martyred people of the oppressed island of the Caribbean will be free from foreign Communist domination, free to choose for themselves, the kind of government they wish to have, and free to join their brothers of the hemisphere in the common undertaking to secure for each individual the liberty, dignity, and well-being which are the objectives of all free societies."

PROGRESS AND FREEDOM

In line with the final thought of that statement, I think we should never lose sight of the fact that our central task in this hemisphere is to promote progress with freedom. This is the vision of the Alliance for Progress. This is the path our governments have set for themselves under the Charter of Punta del Este. And President Johnson said last May in discussing the Alliance with the Ambassadors of your respective countries:

"In devotion to democracy," he said, "we are guided by the command of Bolívar that 'We must fearlessly lay the foundations of South American liberty: to hesitate is destruction.'

"Our charter," the President said, "charges each American country to seek and to strengthen representative democracy. Without that democracy, and the freedom it nourishes, material progress is an aimless enterprise, destroying the dignity of spirit it is meant to liberate. We will continue," Mr. Johnson said, "to join with you to encourage democracy until we build a hemisphere of free nations from Tierra del Fuego to the Arctic Circle."

I close, Mr. Chairman, with one final word, a word I know to be from both the Government and from the people of the United States to our friends throughout the hemisphere, a word on which my fellow countrymen are united, on a nonpartisan basis.

When our Founding Fathers signed our Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Franklin made the famous remark, "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately."

Today, it is Venezuela which is under attack. Is there any one of us who can say with assurance "It cannot be my country tomorrow"? So let's say to our brothers in Venezuela, its Government and its brave people, "We are with you in full solidarity, and will act with you to insure the safety of your democracy." And let's say to the Castro regime, "Your interference in the affairs of other countries in this hemisphere must stop, must stop and stop now." This is the basis on which the attitude of the United

States will rest when we come to the resolutions which will be before us.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish only to add that in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I have set through the sermons of this diplomatic Conference yesterday and today. We shall go back into session at 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. I have read the indictment against Castro's Cuba and I have studied the documents of proof. In my judgment they leave not the slightest doubt as to the transgression of the Rio Treaty by the Castro Communist regime of Cuba.

I completely agree with the position of my Government, and I support without reservation the recommendation of our Secretary of State speaking in behalf of my Government this afternoon. He made clear that the time has come when the members of the Organization of American States must determine whether or not they will make the Rio Treaty an effective instrument for the maintenance of peace in our hemisphere and an enforceable instrument for bringing to end acts of aggression and subversion on the part of Cuba or, any other nation that might commit acts of aggression or subversion against any member nation of the Organization of American States.

Under the Rio Treaty, the signatories thereto mutually pledged that they would come to the assistance and defense of any country in the hemisphere whose sovereignty and whose rights were transgressed against by acts of aggression on the part of any other country.

The time has come when the Rio Treaty, in my judgment, must be applied and sanctions must be imposed upon Cuba on the part of all the signatories to the Rio Treaty, unless the Rio Treaty is to become a scrap of paper.

Speaking only for myself, in my individual capacity as a Senator, a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and chairman of its Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I interpret the major issue of this historic conference of the foreign ministers of the states of the Western Hemisphere to be simply this: Is the Rio Treaty to be a vital instrument for enforcing and maintaining the peace in the Western Hemisphere or is it to become naught but a scrap of paper? The final resolution to be passed later this week by this historic Conference will determine that question.

I wish to say, as the Secretary of State clearly implied in his truly great, historic speech of this afternoon, that it is up to the free nations of the Western Hemisphere to determine whether they are ready and willing to stop now Communist aggression and subversion in the Western Hemisphere by Castro Communist Cuba.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator spoke of the imposition of sanctions. What does he envision by that program?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I do not think that as a participant in the Conference and as one of the aids to the Secretary of State, I should attempt to speak on the question. The Secretary of State has made very clear what the position of our Government is and he is the only one who should speak at this time for our Government as to what kind of sanctions our Government thinks should be adopted.

I speak this afternoon only to place in the RECORD the great speech of the Secretary of State and to make my formal announcement that I stand squarely, solidly, and completely behind the position that the Secretary of State took at the Foreign Ministers Conference this afternoon.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not hear the entire statement of the Senator from Oregon; but the extent to which I heard it permits me to say that I concur in the views which he expressed.

Mr. MORSE. I knew that the Senator from Ohio, as a colleague of mine on the Committee on Foreign Relations, would concur.

MONUMENT COMMEMORATING THE INDEPENDENCE OF MEXICO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGVERN in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 944) to provide for the presentation by the United States to the people of Mexico of a monument commemorating the independence of Mexico, and for other purposes, which was, on page 1, line 10, strike out all after "Sec. 2." over to and including "necessary" on page 2, line 1, and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$150,000."

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, earlier a number of Senators joined me in introducing a bill by which the people of the United States would present to the people of Mexico a likeness, in bronze or stone, of Abraham Lincoln. The people of Mexico are our dear friends and neighbors. They share our love of freedom and our high esteem of the Great Emancipator. The bill passed the House of Representatives yesterday with an amendment placing a ceiling of \$150,000 on the amount to be expended.

I am authorized to say that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] concurs in the amendment, as indeed do I, and as does, I believe, every other Member of the Senate who did the bill the honor of attaching his name to it as a cosponsor.

Under those circumstances, I move

that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2642) to mobilize the human and financial resources of the Nation to combat poverty in the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Senators will be reading the RECORD overnight. I wish to invite attention to the fact that it is my amendment that is now pending. It is the first amendment that was offered. It provides for some element of control by the States over the antipoverty program which is contemplated by the bill, without interfering with the opportunity of the Director to move promptly and expeditiously into any area where immediate action is necessary, even before the State is ready to launch into the activity which is called for.

I spoke on this subject at considerable length earlier in the day. I respectfully refer Senators to the detailed analysis of the amendment and the germaneness to it of other Federal-State programs that are conducted in this field.

I invite attention to the fact that even today an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], which has already been accepted, goes much further, even, in respect of the particular camps that are provided for by title I of the bill, so as to require the consent of the States and 30 days' notice before the camps can even be established in the particular State.

I also point out that the problem is cared for by an amendment which was adopted in committee, in which I concurred, with Mr. Shriver, relating to the use of State camps—and there are many States in which there are such camps—so that there would be no duplication of activities.

But there is no substitute that I think answers the feeling of many Members of this body that the States should have an opportunity to handle what is essentially a State activity, under Federal coordination policies, with Federal help. The States should be given that opportunity. That is what my amendment seeks to accomplish.

I hope the Senate may consider my amendment favorably tomorrow.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

ORDER FOR MORNING HOUR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself half a minute on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets tomorrow, there be a morning hour of not to exceed one-half hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator might wish to suggest that there be a quorum call without the time for the quorum call being charged against his time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 23, 1964, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 22, 1964:

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Lot Ensey, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

In the grade of general

Gen. Thomas S. Power, 481A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Robert W. Burns, 527A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, 585A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Harold W. Grant, 497A (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10 of the United States Code:

Maj. Gen. William W. Momyer, 1964A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Jack G. Merrell, 1687A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

John H. Masters	Lewis W. Walt
George S. Bowman, Jr.	Carl A. Youngdale
	Ormond R. Simpson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

William A. Stiles	Robert G. Owens, Jr.
Louis Metzger	Jonas M. Platt
Homer G. Hutchinson, son,	Clifford B. Drake

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 22, 1964:

POSTMASTER

I withdraw the nomination sent to the Senate on February 3, 1964, of Charlie T. Cummings to be postmaster at Alvarado, in the State of Texas.